



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,485	08/14/2001	Takumi Oishi	ASAM.0018	7901

7590 12/02/2004

Stanley P. Fisher  
Reed Smith Hazel & Thomas LLP  
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400  
Falls Church, VA 22042-4503

EXAMINER

BATURAY, ALICIA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/928,485	OISHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alicia Baturay	2155	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                    |                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11242004</u> .                                                            | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-7 are pending.

#### ***Specification***

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "A Method and System for Persistent Translation Between Protocols."

#### ***Drawings***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 16, line 28, Applicant states "...the packet destined for the terminal 41 transmitted from the terminal 42 is transmitted to the terminal 41 via translator 13 and the home agent 31." However, on Fig. 3, the path from element 42 through 31 to element 41 goes through translator 12. It is believed Applicant meant to show the path going through translator 13 on the drawing. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant states the following in part 2 of the claim, "...in said second protocol providing to said terminal." It is suggested that Applicant revise this to read "...in said second protocol *and* providing said second address to said terminal." Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant states "...in said second protocol provided to said translator." It is suggested that Applicant revise this to read "...in said second protocol *and* provided to said translator." Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1, part 2 recites "said terminal" and it is unclear as to whether the first or second terminal is being specified.
8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
9. Claim 2 recites the limitations "second mobile terminal" and "second terminal." There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. However, it is noted that claim 1, part 1 discusses "a terminal" and "a first mobile terminal."

Art Unit: 2155

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant does not distinctly point out which translator receives the corresponding protocol translation information. It is thought that Applicant meant to write "...and transmitting the corresponding protocol translation information to *a* translator..."
11. Claim 5 recites the limitations "the address" and "the terminal" There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.
12. Claim 6 recites the limitation "said second protocol." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
13. Claim 7 recites the limitation "the terminal accommodated in said first network." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

15. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vaudreuil et al.  
(U.S. 5,940,478)

Art Unit: 2155

16. As to claim 4, Vaudreuil discloses a method of providing protocol translation information at a translation server (Vaudreuil, Fig. 1, element 37) connected to a plurality of translators each performing a translation between a first protocol and a second protocol (Vaudreuil, col. 22, line 64-col. 23, line 4), comprising the steps of: receiving protocol translation information retained in each of said plurality of translators therefrom (Vaudreuil, col. 7, lines 42-47); retaining the protocol translation information and searching the retained protocol translation information and transmitting the corresponding protocol translation information to the translator when receiving a query of protocol translation information from one of said plurality of translators (Vaudreuil, col. 18, lines 1-22).

17. As to claim 5, Vaudreuil discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 4, including a method of providing protocol translation information, where said protocol translation information is a correspondence between the address in said first protocol provided to the terminal and the address in said second protocol generated in each translator corresponding to it (Vaudreuil, col. 22, line 64 – col. 23, line 4).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2155

19. Claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millet (U.S. 6,434,627) and further in view of Tsirtsis ("Network Address Translation - Protocol Translation (NAT-PT)").
20. As to claim 1, Millet discloses a method of translating addresses at a translator (Millet, Fig. 1B, element 111; col. 6, lines 22-25) connected to a first network (Millet, Fig. 1B, element 105; col. 6, lines 24-25) and to a second network (Millet, Fig. 1B, element 103), and to a translation server to which other translators are connected (Millet, col. 13, lines 57-62), said translator retaining translation information for a protocol translation between said first protocol and said second protocol (Millet, Fig. 7, element 715; col. 13, lines 30-32), the method comprising the steps of: detecting an address query of a terminal accommodated in said second network, from a first mobile terminal accommodated in said first network; generating a second address in said first protocol corresponding to a first address in said second protocol provided to said terminal (Millet, Fig. 7); retaining a correspondence between said first address and said second address as said translation information (Millet, Fig. 7, element 715; col. 13, lines 30-32) and registering the correspondence between said first address and said second address at said translation server (Millet, col. 12, Lines 34-43). The embodiment of the address translation system on a router and several address translation lists being present inherently suggests that there are multiple translators that share their respective translation lists. Millet does not explicitly disclose the use of two differing protocols. However, Tsirtsis does discuss a process of translation of protocols (Tsirtsis, page 4, "Protocol Translation (PT)") for transferring data in a first protocol and for transferring

Art Unit: 2155

data in a second protocol (Tsirtsis, page 4, "Protocol Translation (PT)"). It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Millet and Tsirtsis to allow transparency protocol translation from the view of the client (Tsirtsis, page 2, paragraph 3).

21. As to claim 6, Millet-Tsirtsis discloses an address translation server connected to a first network (Millet, Fig. 1B, element 111) for transferring data in a first protocol, comprising a name of a terminal accommodated in a second network for transferring data in said first protocol, an address in said second protocol corresponding to said name (Tsirtsis, page 9, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph to the end), and a table containing a correspondence between said address and an address in said first protocol generated correspondingly to said address (Millet, Fig. 7, element 715).

22. As to claim 7, Millet-Tsirtsis discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 6, including an address translation server where the address in said first protocol is transmitted to said terminal upon receiving an address query for said name from the terminal accommodated in said first network (Tsirtsis, page 9, "The "A" record is then returned to Node-C.").

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person



Art Unit: 2155

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millet-Tsirtsis and further in view of Vaudreuil.

25. As to claim 2, Millet and Tsirtsis (Millet-Tsirtsis) discloses the method of translating protocols where upon receiving a packet having said second address as a destination IP address from said second mobile terminal at the address in said first protocol in which a source IP address is provided to said second terminal as a result of a movement of said second mobile terminal which has been communicating with said terminal (Millet, col. 6, lines 53-60). However, Millet-Tsirtsis does not teach the use of multiple translators. However in analogous art, Vaudreuil teaches other translators (Vaudreuil, col. 7, lines 42-47), further comprising the steps of: inquiring of said translation server about address information of said terminal (Vaudreuil, col. 18, lines 17-22); receiving the correspondence between said first address and said second address registered by said other translators from said server (Vaudreuil, col. 7, lines 42-47); rewriting said destination IP address to said first address (Millet, col. 6, lines 53-60); and transmitting said rewritten packet to said terminal (Tsirtsis, page 9, last paragraph). It would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Millet-Tsirtsis and Vaudreuil to facilitate communication between networks using differing protocols (Vaudreuil, col. 2, lines 6-9).

Art Unit: 2155

26. As to claim 3, Millet-Tsirsis and Vaudreuil (Millet-Tsirsis-Vaudreuil) disclose the invention substantially including the method of translating protocols where said source IP address is rewritten to the address in said second protocol provided to said translator (Tsirsis, page 12, "Source Address").

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at 7:30am - 5pm, Monday - Thursday, and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB



**HOSAIN ALAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**